DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 004 JC 690 042

By-Stein, Ruth S.

Student Evaluation of the High-School Honors Program at Los Angeles City College.

Los Angeles City Coll., Calif.
Report No-LACC-RS-68-13
Pub Date Dec 68
Note-25p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
Descriptors-*College High School Cooperation, *Honors Curriculum, *Junior Colleges, *Questionnaires, *Student Evaluation
Identifiers-*California

The 276 students who had completed courses in the high school honors program at Los Angeles City College between Spring 1964 and Fall 1967 were sent a questionnaire in an attempt to determine whether they regarded the experience as valuable, and to solicit suggestions for possible modifications of the program. The 58% who responded answered questions about the following topics: (1) reasons for choosing to participate in the program, and for enrolling in the subjects completed; (2) comparison of academic plans while at LACC with current plans; (3) possible areas of conflict between high school (and other) obligations and attending the honors classes at LACC; (4) advantages and disadvantages of program participation; (5) recommendations about the grade level best for participation; (6) possible attitude changes resulting from participation; and (7) suggestions for improving the program. Responses are reported in self-explanatory tables, presented in declining order of frequency and percentage of responses. The results indicate that participating students view the program favorably, and many recommend participation by more students in more courses. These favorable responses are consistent with previous studies on the academic performance of these students that show the program to be successful and worthy of encouragement by high school and college advisors. (MC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE

# "STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE HIGH-SCHOOL HONORS PROGRAM AT LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE"

Research Study #68-13

Ruth S. Stein
December, 1968
Office of Research

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 24 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 690 042

# "STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE HIGH-SCHOOL HONORS PROGRAM AT LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE"

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Since 1960, Los Angeles City College has been receiving groups of high-school seniors recommended by their counselors for advanced enrollment and credit in college courses. Los Angeles City College Counseling Center Research Studies #61-10, 63-16, and 67-10 have summarized the scholastic performance of these students. It seemed desirable in addition, however, to request the reactions of a sampling of these young people in order to determine whether they regarded the experience of advance college attendance as valuable, and to request suggestions for possible modifications of the program.

## PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

Between Spring, 1964, and Fall, 1967, 276 students completed courses in the high-school honors program. A questionnaire (appended), with return envelope, was sent to these participants. There were 235 whose addresses were presumably current, since the questionnaires were not returned as undeliverable; this represents 85% of those originally enrolled during the four-year period. Of the 235 deliverable questionnaires sent, replies were received from 137, or 58%. The replies were coded only by semester of first attendance; further identification by name, on high-school origin, or information on courses taken, was not requested.

The items were designed to elicit information about the following:

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY (continued)

1. Reasons for choosing to participate in the program and for enrolling in the subjects completed.
2. Comparison between academic plans and goals at the time of LACC attendance and at the time of returning the questionnaire.
3. Possible areas of conflict between high-school and outside obligations and time needed for LACC classes.
4. Advantages and disadvantages of participation in the program.
5. Recommendations about the grade level best for participation.
6. Possible changes in attitude resulting from participation.
7. Suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the program.

The tables will be self-explanatory. For most of the questions, the responses are presented in declining order of frequency. Since some respondents gave more than one answer, percentages in many tables total more than 100% of the 137 returned surveys.

TABLE I - Numbers of Responses

| Session of first attendance | Number sent and delivered | Number of responses | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Spring 1964 | 28 | 14 | 50 % |
| Summer Session 1964 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Fall 1964 | 19 | 7 | 37 % |
| Spring 1965 | 20 | 16 | 80 % |
| Summer Session 1965 | 4 | 1 | 25 % |
| Fall 1965 | 26 | 21 | 81 % |
| Spring 1966 | 19 | 17 | 89 % |
| Summer Session 1966 | 28 | 12 | 43 % |
| Fall 1966 | 29 | 9 | 32 % |
| Spring 1967 | 26 | 15 | 58 % |
| Summer Session 1967 | 22 | 14 | 64 % |
| Fall 4967 | 15 | 11 | 73 % |
| T O T A L S | 235 | 137 | 58 % |

TABLE 3 - What Were Your Reasons for Participating in the Program?

| Responses (roughly grouped) | No | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. To have an introduction to college experience; challenge of college; more intense experience; transition | 86 | 63% |
| 2. Wanted to start earning college units; to lighten freshman load | 39 | 28% |
| 3. To get classes not offered in high school; to go on in a specific field | 20 | 15% |
| 4. To evade boredom or regimentation or lack of intellectual challenge in high school | 15 | 11% |
| 5. To seek greater variety; to broaden educational experience | 11 | 8% |
| 6. To use time available because of completion of high-school requirements | 10 | 7% |
| 7. To follow high-school counselor's or instructor's advice | 7 | 5% |
| 8. To discharge some general education or Subject A) requirements early | 4 | 3% |
| 9. To acquire prestige, ego-boost; be with friends | 4 | 3% |
| 10. As a second choice because of ineligibility for UCLA program | 3 | 3% |
| 11. To explore a possible college major | 2 | 1% |
| 12. Miscellaneous responses: Enjoyed summer school<br>Excuse for using family car<br>Improve chances of admission to a private college<br>LACC instructor had been recommended<br>Evaluate LACC for possible continuation | 6 (1 each) | |

TABLE 3 - What Were Your Reasons for Choosing the Subject(s) You Enrolled In?

| Responses (roughly grouped) | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Interest in a new field | 50 | 37% |
| 2. Part of a sequence for a major | 43 | 31% |
| 3. Satisfy general education (or Subject A requirements | 35 | 26% |
| 4. Convenient time of day | 6 | 4% |
| 5. Unavailable at high school (scheduling conflict, etc.) | 4 | 3% |
| 6. Test or develop capabilities | 4 | 3% |
| 7. Advice of previous honors students | 4 | 3% |
| 8. Counselor's suggestion | 3 | 3% |

TABLE 3
Responses (continued)

| | | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Appropriate time for an elective | 3% | 3% |
| 10. | Wanted a more intensive course than was offered in high school | 3 | 3% |
| 11. | To be with friends | 3 | 3% |
| 12. | Curiosity about methods of teaching the subject | 2 | 1% |
| 13. | Continuity in a previously developed field of interest | 2 | 1% |
| 14. | Developing useful tools or general background of knowledge | 2 | 1% |
| 15. | Not too difficult as an introduction to college | 2 | 1% |
| 16. | "No specific reason" | 2 | 1% |
| 17. | Miscellaneous responses | 3 (1 each) | |
| | No other interesting subjects | | |
| | Needed one class to transfer back for high-school graduation | | |
| | Supplement current high-school work | | |
| 18. | No response | 1 | |

TABLE 4 - What Were Your College Plans When You Participated in the Program?

| | College(s) of choice | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | UCLA | 79 | 58% |
| 2. | California State College, Los Angeles | 26 | 19% |
| 3. | University of Southern California | 17 | 12% |
| 4. | Los Angeles City College | 16 | 11% |
| 5. | University of California, Berkeley | 14 | 10% |
| 6. | Stanford | 8 | 6% |
| 7. | Claremont Colleges | 6 | 4% |
| 8. | University of California (campus undesignated) | 5 | 4% |
| 9. | University of California, Santa Barbara | 4 | 3% |
| 10. | San Fernando Valley State College | 3 | 3% |
| 11. | California Institute of Technology | 3 | 3% |
| 12. | University of California, Riverside | 2 | 1% |
| 13. | Harvard | 2 | 1% |
| 14. | Carleton | 2 | 1% |
| 15. | Dartmouth | 2 | 1% |
| 16. | Miscellaneous | 15 (1 each) | |
| | U. C. Santa Cruz | Cornell | |
| | Mills | Wellesley | |
| | Johns Hopkins | Vassar | |
| | Sorbonne | Northwestern | |
| | Brigham Young University | Yale | |
| | Calif.State, Long Beach | Massachusetts Inst. Tech. | |
| | Carnegie Inst. Tech. | Calif. Inst. of Arts | |
| | Occidental | | |
| 17. | "Undecided" | 3 | 3% |
| 18. | No response | 1 | 1% |

TABLE 5 - If You Are Now In College, Where Are You Attending?

| | College | No. | Respondents | % of those in college |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | University of California, Los Angeles | 59 | 44% | 48% |
| 2. | California State College at Los Angeles | 11 | 8% | 9% |
| 3. | University of California, Berkeley | 11 | 8% | 9% |
| 4. | Los Angeles City College | 11 | 8% | 9% |
| 5. | University of Southern California | 10 | 8% | 8% |
| 6. | California State, San Fernando Valley | 3 | 2% | 2% |
| 7. | University of California, Santa Cruz | 2 | 1% | 2% |
| 8. | Pacific University (Oregon) | 2 | 1% | 2% |
| 9. | Miscellaneous | 14 (1 each) | 10% | 11% |

California State, Long Beach
University of California, San Francisco Medical
Columbia University
Claremont Colleges
Yale
Dartmouth
Bringham Young (Utah)
Oregon State University
Reed College
Stanford University
Vassar
Los Angeles Trade Technical College
El Camino College

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | 123 | | 100% |
| 10. | Not in college | 14 | 10% | |
| | Totals | 137 | 100% | |

TABLE 6 - If You Attended Another College Before the One Now Attended, Where Did You Go?
(Each entry represents one response)

| Previous College | Length of Attendance | Present College |
|---|---|---|
| U.C. Santa Barbara | 9 Q | UCLA |
| Santa Monica City College and L.A. Valley College | 1 SS | |
| Pasadena City College | 1 SS | UCLA |
| UCLA | 1 SS | UCLA |
| UCLA | 4 Q | Los Angeles City College |
| Cornell University | 2 Q | Los Angeles City College |
| UCLA | 1 Q | Los Angeles City College |
| USC, and UCLA, and LACC | 1 Q | Los Angeles City College |
| USC | 2 S | Calif. State at Los Angeles |
| LACC | 3 Q + 1 SS | |
| | 1 SS | |
| | 1 SS | Calif. State at Los Angeles |
| | 4 S | Calif. State at Los Angeles |

(Table 6 continued on Page 6)

TABLE 6 (continued)

| Previous College | Length of Attendance | Present College |
|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles City College | 1 SS | Calif. State at Los Angeles |
| U. of Calif., Santa Cruz | 6 Q | U. of Calif., Berkeley |
| Scripps College | 4 S | U. of Calif., Berkeley |
| U. of Calif., Los Angeles | 3 Q | U. of Calif., Berkeley |
| U. of Calif., Los Angeles | 1 S + 1 SS | U. of Calif., Santa Cruz |
| U. of Calif., Los Angeles | 3 Q | U. of Calif., Santa Cruz |
| Los Angeles Valley College | 3 S | San Francisco State College |
| and San Francisco City College | 1 S | |
| U. of Calif., Los Angeles | 1 Q | Dartmouth College |
| Totals ..... | 18 | |

Key: Q = quarter S = semester SS = summer session

TABLE 7 - Original College of Choice, Versus College Actually Attended

| | | Number | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | **Unchanged** | | |
| 1. | U. of California, Los Angeles | 43 | 35% |
| 2. | U. of Calif., Berkeley | 7 | 6% |
| 3. | U. of Southern Calif. | 4 | 3% |
| 4. | Los Angeles City College | 3 | 2% |
| 5. | Calif. State, Los Angeles | 3 | 2% |
| 6. | Miscellaneous (1 each) | 11 | 9% 8% |
| | | 71 | 57% |
| B. | **Narrowed down choice of colleges** | | |
| 1. | To U. of Calif, L.A. | 9 | 7% |
| 2. | To Calif. State, L.A. | 6 | 5% |
| 3. | To U. of Southern Calif. | 4 | 3% |
| 4. | To Los Angeles City College | 2 | 2% |
| 5. | Miscellaneous | 10 (1 each) | |
| | | 31 | 25% |
| C. | **Changed original stated choice** | | |
| 1. | Los Angeles City College to U. of Calif., L.A. | 3 | 2% |
| 2. | L. A. City College to other colleges | 2 | 2% |
| 3. | U. of Calif., Los Angeles | 7 | 6% |
| 4. | U. of Calif., Berkeley to other colleges | 2 | 2% |
| 5. | Miscellaneous (1 each) | 7 | 6% |
| | Total | 21 123 | 18% 100% |

TABLE 8 - If You Are Not Now Attending College, (a) What are you doing, and (b) Do you plan to return to college?

| Present Occupation | Plan to Return to College | No Plan To Return to College |
|---|---|---|
| Account clerk | 1 | |
| Draftsman, Air Force | 1 | |
| Dental Assistant | 1 | |
| House wife | 1 | |
| Supply man | | 1 |
| Clerk-Typist | | 1 |
| Postal assistant | | 1 |
| Draftsman | | 1 |
| High-school student | 6 | |
| | 10 (7% of 137) | 4 (3% of 137) |

TABLE 9 - What College Major Were You Planning When You Participated in the Program?

| Classification | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Natural Sciences, Mathematics | 48 | 35% |
| Biology | 3 | |
| Chemistry | 9 | |
| Mathematics | 25 | |
| Physiology | 1 | |
| Physics | 3 | |
| "Science" | 2 | |
| Statistics | 1 | |
| Zoology | 4 | |
| 2. Social Sciences | 32 | 23% |
| Asian Studies | 1 | |
| Economics | 1 | |
| Education | 5 | |
| History | 5 | |
| Political Science | 5 | |
| Psychology | 8 | |
| Public Relations | 1 | |
| Sociology | 4 | |
| "Social Science" | 2 | |
| 3. Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, Humanities | 24 | 18% |
| Architecture | 2 | |
| Art | 6 | |
| English | 10 | |
| Foreign Language | 4 | |
| Humanities | 1 | |
| Literature | 1 | |

(Table 9 continued on page 8)

TABLE 9 (continued)

| Classification | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Engineering | 19 | 13% |
| 5. Health Sciences | | |
| Nursing | 1 | ≤1% |
| Physical Education | 2 | 2% |
| Pre-dental | 1 | ≤1% |
| Pre-medical | 7 | 5% |
| Pre-pharmacy | 1 | ≤1% |
| | 12 | 9% |
| 6. Technical, Occupational Training | | |
| Broadcasting | 1 | ≤1% |
| Computer science | 1 | ≤1% |
| Information engineering | 1 | ≤1% |
| Secretarial science | 1 | ≤1% |
| | 4 | 3% |
| 7. Business Administration | 2 | ≤1% |
| | 2 | 1% |
| 8. "None" or "Undecided" | 15 | 12% |
| | 15 | 12% |

TABLE 10 - If You Are Now Attending College, What is Your Major?

| Classification | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Natural sciences, mathematics | | |
| Biology | 1 | ≤1% |
| Chemistry | 6 | 5% |
| Biostatistics | 1 | ≤1% |
| Geophysics | 1 | ≤1% |
| Mathematics | 16 | 13% |
| Physiology | 1 | ≤1% |
| Physics | 3 | 2% |
| Statistics | 1 | ≤1% |
| Bateriology | 2 | 2% |
| Zoology | 2 | 2% |
| | 34 | 27% |
| 2. Social sciences | | |
| Asian studies | 1 | ≤1% |
| Anthropology | 3 | 2% |
| Economics | 4 | 3% |
| Education | 4 | 3% |
| History | 3 | 2% |
| Psychology | 9 | 7% |
| Political science | 4 | 3% |
| Sociology | 4 | 3% |
| Social sciences | 5 | 4% |
| Social welfare | 2 | 2% |
| | 38 | 29% |

(Table 10 continued on Page 8-a)

TABLE 10 (continued)

| Classification | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 3. Liberal arts, fine arts, humanities | | |
| Architecture, environmental design | 2 | 2% |
| Art | 5 | 4% |
| Classics | 1 | ≤1% |
| English; literature | 10 | 8% |
| Foreign language | 4 | 3% |
| Philosophy | 3 | 2% |
| | 25 | 20% |
| 4. Engineering | 11 | 9% |
| 5. Health sciences | | |
| Pharmacy | 1 | ≤1% |
| Physical education | 2 | 2% |
| Pre-medical | 4 | 3% |
| Nursing | 1 | ≤1% |
| | 8 | 7% |
| 6. Technical, occupational training | | |
| Secretarial science | 1 | ≤1% |
| 7. Business administration | 2 | 2% |
| 8. "None" or "undecided" | 4 | 3% |
| | 123 | 100% |
| 9. Not enrolled in college | 14 | |

TABLE 11 - Were Your Educational or Vocational Plans Affected by Participating in Our Program?

| | No | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. No | 91 | 66% |
| Plans were already set | 5 | |
| Plans were flexible | 3 | |
| No bearing on major or vocational plans | 3 | |
| But greater anxiety to begin full-time college | 2 | |
| But the experience and units helpful later | 2 | |
| But perhaps influenced choice of major | 1 | |
| 2. Yes | 44 | 33% |
| Confirmed major choice | 11 | |
| Reduced freshman course load | 7 | |
| Narrowed down major choice | 6 | |
| Changed major choice | 5 | |
| Decided to continue at LACC | 3 | |
| Decided to start university as soon as possible | 3 | |
| Improved skills (mathematics, communication) | 2 | |
| Broadened major choice | 1 | |
| Maintained interest, but did not pursue as a major | 1 | |
| Helped to accelerate high-school graduation | 1 | |
| Made college adjustment easier | 1 | |
| Allowed accelerated college graduation | 1 | |
| 3. No response | 1 | ≤1% |

TABLE 12 - Did Being in Our Program Interfere With Other Activities? Which Activities?

| | No. | % of Respondents |
|---|---|---|
| 1. No interference | 54 | 40% |
| 2. Blank | 25 | 18% |
| 3. Various activities checked or listed in comments: | 58 | 42% |
| a. Senior class & pre-graduation activities | 20 | 15% |
| b. Special high-school classes | 18 | 13% |
| c. School organizations | 14 | 10% |
| d. Part-time work | 13 | 10% |
| e. Student-body or class offices | 11 | 8% |
| f. Athletics | 5 | 4% |
| g. Out-of-school organizations | 3 | 2% |
| h. Difficulties in high school scheduling to allow time for LACC | 4 | 3% |
| i. Hobbies, recreation | 3 | 2% |
| j. Honor societies | 2 | >1% |
| k. Special out-of-school activities | 2 | >1% |
| l. Miscellaneous responses | 4 (1 each) | |
| "Some" high school activities | | |
| Home responsibilities | | |
| "Deglamorized the high school experience" | | |
| All of the above "pleasingly absent, or at least not so annoyingly nagging" | | |

TABLE 13 - What Were the Advantages of Participation?

| | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Helped the high school-college transition; anticipation of college process and atmosphere | 82 | 60% |
| 2. Lightened freshman load; gave extra points | 30 | 22% |
| 3. Enjoyed treatment as a responsible, independent, intelligent individual | 16 | 7% |
| 4. Introduced to challenge, competition; built self-discipline | 14 | 10% |
| 5. Gave chance for new and relevant topics | 13 | 10% |
| 6. Checked off general education requirements | 11 | 8% |
| 7. Enjoyed contacts with other ages and ethnic groups | 11 | 8% |

(Table 13 continued on Page 11)

TABLE 13 (continued)

| | | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | Allowed early progress in major | 10 | 7% |
| 9. | Enjoyed high-quality instruction (or commended a particular instructor) | 9 | 7% |
| 10. | Was reassured over qualms about ability to perform | 8 | 6% |
| 11. | Enjoyed change of pace and released time | 8 | 6% |
| 12. | Introduced to junior college instruction and final examinations | 7 | 5% |
| 13. | Appreciated deeper investigation of topics; "true learning for once in my life" | 7 | 5% |
| 14. | Gained social confidence with high-school peers, or with college-age students; increased self-knowledge | 6 | 4% |
| 15. | Avoided Subject A by taking English 1 | 6 | 4% |
| 16. | Was helped to choose a college, or a major | 5 | 3% |
| 17. | Found it an "interesting" or "rewarding" experience | 3 | 2% |
| 18. | Enriched high-school course work | 3 | 2% |
| 19. | Course prepared for a part-time college job | 2 | >1% |
| 20. | Helped to be admitted by "selective" college | 2 | >1% |
| 21. | Miscellaneous | 7 (1 each) | |
| | Enjoyed varied media of instruction | | |
| | Realized need for broad background for college work | | |
| | Appreciated choice of instructors | | |
| | Appreciated the concern of high-school teachers for individual learning | | |
| | Incentive to start other honors courses | | |
| | Appreciated use of college library | | |
| | "Helped mature me a little" | | |
| 22. | No answer | 11 | |
| 23. | "None" | 11 | |

TABLE 14 - What Were the Disadvantages of Participation?

| | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Time and expense of transportation | 20 | 15% |
| 2. Too easy or too pedantic; unrepresentative of university (or LACC) demands or teaching methods | 13 | 10% |
| 3. Having to give up student-body or senior activities | 7 | 5% |
| 4. Alienation from high school, or later boredom with high school | 5 | 3% |

| | | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | Amount of work in the total school load | 4 | 3% |
| 6. | Having to give up advanced high school courses | 3 | 2% |
| 7. | Interference with hish school studying or extra laboratory work | 2 | 1% |
| 8. | Difficulty of college competition (because of immaturity, or of heavy total load) | 2 | 1% |
| 9. | Being under 2 standards simultaneously | 2 | 1% |
| 10. | Lack of time for instructor conferences and for study | 2 | 1% |
| 11. | Miscellaneous | 15 (1 each) | |
| | No formal high school recognition for this participation | | |
| | Slow communication between high school and LACC | | |
| | Gathering up materials and books (for art) | | |
| | "Too impersonal;" difficulty in identifying with college students | | |
| | Alienation from both high school and college | | |
| | Believe the college instructor graded high school participants more leniently | | |
| | Formation of bad study habits | | |
| | Regret it wasn't available earlier | | |
| | Regret that by special permission he took his course at night; would have learned more in a day class | | |
| | Resented smoking in classrooms and dirty campus | | |
| | Difficulty in adjusting to new expectations in summer session | | |
| | Parking problems | | |
| | Questionable equivalency of unit credit upon transfer | | |
| | Discovered an error in UCLA's evaluation; this has been corrected | | |
| 12. | "No disadvantages" | 49 | 37% |
| 13. | "Even though <u>some</u> people...., <u>I</u> found none" | 3 | 2% |
| 14. | No response | 20 | 15% |
| | | 72 | 54% |

TABLE 15 - Would You Advise Other Qualified Students to Participate? When?

| | Yes | % | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. No term specified | 14 | 10% | 0 | |
| 2. In the B 11 semester | 30 | 22% | 32 | 23% |
| 3. In the A 11 semester | 38 | 28% | 32 | 23% |
| 4. In the B 12 semester | 112 | 82% | 6 | 4% |
| 5. In the A 12 semester | 121 | 88% | 0 | |
| 6. Summer sessions | 104 | 76% | 0 | |

(Table 15 continued on Page 13)

| Comments | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. By those favoring 12th grade enrollment: | | |
| a. Eleventh graders are too immature; might be hindered socially, or might lose interest in high school | 23 | 17% |
| b. A-12 semester, perhaps with summer session, is best | 13 | 10% |
| c. B-12 preferable, because of conflict with graduation activities | | |
| d. B-12 best, for improving study habits and helping plan A 12 program | 3 | 2% |
| e. 11th grade time needed for high school requirements | 9 | 4% |
| f. A 12 best; <u>not</u> summer session | 4 | 3% |
| g. Recommend loosening of selectivity so that many 12th graders can participate | 3 | 2% |
| h. Only after developing composition skills | 1 | 1% |
| i. Only if aware of interference with student activities | 1 | 1% |
| 2. By those favoring 11th grade enrollment: | | |
| a. For evaluating college experience and better transition | 13 | 10% |
| b. For wider exploration and enhanced peer- and self-image | 5 | 3% |
| c. To allow better motivation for advanced work | 5 | 3% |
| d. A-11 (or A11-B12) not B11, recommended | 5 | 3% |
| e. "Maybe," if qualified | 3 | 2% |
| f. To "allow a last chance for relaxed learning" | 1 | 1% |
| g. To complete all possible general education courses | 1 | 1% |
| h. Provided they are given wide subject choice and special attention | 1 | 1% |
| 3. By those favoring summer session | | |
| a. Summer sessions <u>only</u>, or judged best | 12 | 9% |
| b. As a more pleasant, less anxious experience; not necessarily atypical | 1 | 1% |
| 4. By those indicating disapproval of summer participation | | |
| a. Not a true picture of college | 1 | 1% |
| b. OK, but less fun | 1 | 1% |
| 5. By those preferring participation as early as possible, by individual potential | | |
| a. Rather than using grade placement | 7 | 5% |
| b. Rather than using rigid GPA criteria | 2 | 1% |
| c. To explore more areas, one at a time | 1 | 1% |
| d. To avoid programming lockstep and improve self-and-peer image | 1 | 1% |
| e. "A marvelous opportunity" for all qualified students | 1 | 1% |

TABLE 16 - What Was the Major Change in Your Attitude Towards or Expectations of College Resulting From Your LACC Experience?

| | | No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Found classes easier than expected | 51 | 37% |
| | No value judgment | 12 | 9% |
| | Gained confidence, reassurance | 23 | 19% |
| | Had false idea of university demands | 5 | 3% |
| | LACC more like high school, though with more freedom, or different student-teacher relationship | 11 | 8% |
| 2. | Learned to take responsibility, to exert more effort | 19 | 14% |
| 3. | Heightened anticipation of college | 8 | 6% |
| 4. | Opinion of LACC enhanced | 5 | 3% |
| 5. | Gave direction to high school work | 4 | 3% |
| 6. | Found less maturity than expected in college students or in classrooms | 3 | 2% |
| 7. | Found classes less stimulating than expected | 3 | 2% |
| 8. | Found instructors cold, giving too little individual attention | 2 | 1% |
| 9. | Miscellaneous responses | 13 (1 each) | 1% |
| | Rubbed off some glamor from college image | | |
| | Learned how to take notes and exams from lectures | | |
| | Developed frear attitudes on subject material and attendance | | |
| | Found mature participation in clubs and rallies | | |
| | Found students had less freedom than expected | | |
| | Enjoyed being with minority groups | | |
| | Found he wasn't ready for college | | |
| | Found many students serious about education | | |
| | Was prepared for "outrageous" competition of any college | | |
| | Decided that the student's involvement in college (not the nature of the college) was principal factor in adjustment | | |
| | Found more emphasis on grades than expected | | |
| | Found class procedures (by discussion) unexpected | | |
| | Enjoyed friendliness in classrooms | | |
| 10. | Remembers no major change | 23 | 17% |
| 11. | No response | 18 | 13% |

TABLE 17 - What Suggestions Do You Have About the Program?

| | No | % |
|---|---|---|
| **A. Course offerings** | | |
| 1. Offer greatest possible latitude in course selection | 25 | 18% |
| 2. Relax unit limitation | 25 | 18% |
| 3. Don't offer special courses, grouping or treatment for honors students | 6 | 4% |
| 4. Encourage taking courses for breadth | 4 | 3% |
| 5. Group honors students together | 2 | 1% |
| 6. Offer special seminars for honors students | 2 | 1% |
| 7. Encourage courses to satisfy general education requirements | 2 | 1% |
| 8. Provide special courses for minority-group students | 2 | 1% |
| 9. Provide more afternoon classes | 1 | 1% |
| 10. Permit evening attendance after first semester | 1 | 1% |
| 11. Allow a sequence of college -major courses | 1 | 1% |
| 12. Offer more classed by Ed'l. TV | 1 | 1% |
| **B. Advisement** | | |
| 1. More high-school guidance needed | | |
| General | 7 | 5% |
| Choice of courses; availability of course description | 10 | 7% |
| Early publicizing of the program, to allow planning of entire high school sequence | 8 | 6% |
| More careful screening by ability | 1 | 1% |
| 2. High school advisor praised | 1 | 1% |
| 3. Better college advisement needed | | |
| More screening needed for specific courses (i.e., mathematics) | 3 | 2% |
| Advisement on instructor selection helpful | 3 | 2% |
| Less challenging courses should be avoided | 1 | 1% |
| Minority group students should be be actively encouraged | 1 | 1% |
| 4. College advisement was helpful | 4 | 3% |
| 5. Closer cooperation between high school and college advisor needed to avoid misunderstanding | 1 | 1% |
| **C. Other suggestions** | | |
| 1. Expand eligibility, earlier, and/or by relaxing other selection standards | 9 | 7% |
| 2. Allow high-school credit for honors courses, or excuse from comparable high school requirements (i.e., English composition) | 5 | 3% |

TABLE 17 (continued)

C. Other suggestions

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3. Allow pass-fail grading, or late drop without penalty | 4 | 3% |
| 4. Individual LACC instructors warmly praised | 2 | 1% |
| 5. Hold one general meeting of honors participants to compare experiences and to socialize | 1 | 1% |
| 6. Encourage greater involvement in LACC affairs | 1 | 1% |
| 7. Hold preliminary orientation meeting to help initial acquaintence with campus | 1 | 1% |
| D. General approval, but no suggestions | 5 | 3% |
| E. "None" | 10 | 7% |
| F. No response | 30 | 22% |

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Of 235 deliverable questionnaires, responses were received from 58% (Table 1). These responses indicated (Table 2) that by far the most popular reason for participation in the program was to make the transition to college life; following in reduced order of frequency were the desire to speed progress or lighten college unit loads, and to obtain classes to broaden horizons or to pursue major interests.

The two most frequently given reasons for subject choice (Table 3) are related to the above types of motivation: interest in a new field, and initiating a sequence for a college major. The third reason for choosing a particular subject was to satisfy one or more general education requirements.

At time of attendance at LACC (Table 4), 58% planned to attend UCLA, 19% to go to California State College at Los Angeles, and 10% to 12% each to USC, and UC Berkeley. At time of response to the questionnaire (Table 5), 48% of those in college were at UCLA, and between 8% and 9% each were attending CSCLA, UC Berkeley, LACC, and USC. The shifting which had taken place during the time interval is summarized in Tables 6 and 7. Eighteen students had attended one or more intervening colleges before transferring to their present

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (continued)

institutions. UCLA showed the highest constancy rate: 52 of the original 59 planning to go there were attending UCLA at time of response, 43 as their only original choice and 9 more as a result of narrowing their choices. An additional 8 students had attended UCLA (not all by original choice), but were now elsewhere. Of the 10 originally thinking of USC, 4 actually attended there as their only choice, and 4 more as a result of narrowing their choices. Of the 11 students originally choosing UC Berkeley as their only choice, 7 were attending there.

Only 14 respondents (Table 8) were not currently in college, and 6 of these had participated the previous summer or fall and had not yet graduated from high school. Of the remaining 8, four planned to take further college work. We are dealing here with a group highly motivated towards college, and almost all of them continue their college work immediately after high-school graduation.

At time of attendance at LACC, the largest group had tentatively chosen a major (Table 9) in the natural or health sciences or in engineering -- a total of 57%. The social sciences attracted 23%, and the liberal arts and humanities 18%. Twelve percent had been undecided as to major. At time of reporting (Table 10), 43% were still in the science-mathematics area, 29% were in the social sciences, and 20% were in the arts and humanities. Although this represents a shift away from the natural and applied sciences, the proportions of such majors still are not the same as in the general population of four-year college students. One reason for the proportion is that a large group of our high-school honors students (averaging 12%) comes specifically to take the calculus courses not available in their own schools; these are often students

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (continued)

gifted in mathematics and planning to use it in a college major.

Apparently, the LACC experience did not change the educational or vocational plans of many of the participants (Table 11). Two-thirds of the respondents reported no change. Of the remaining one-third, most of the responses indicated that the change was minor -- confirming or narrowing down choice of major, or merely reducing freshman course load, for example.

Forty percent reported that participation in this program did not interfere with other activities, and an additional 18% left the item blank (Table 12). The remaining 42% reported various types of interference, mainly with senior class activities, special high-school classes, school organizations or student government, or with part-time work. A number of these mentioned that the interference was unimportant, or foreseen, or even welcome.

Table 13 presents a rough classification of the advantages listed by the participants. The frequency of the resppnses parallels rather closely the purposes listed for their original participation (Tables 2 and 3). Many of the advantages center around making a successful college transition, early completion of general education courses or of a major sequence, developing study skills or self-confidence, and introduction to broader selection of courses. Only four respondents listed no advantages at all.

Table 14 indicates that 54% listed no disadvantages in their participation. Of those who did, the time and expense of transportation was mentioned with most frequency (by 15% of the respondents). Ten percent expressed disappointment in the level of the demands or challenges of the course, often because they considered it unrepresentative of their [illegible] junior-college or

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (continued)

four-year college experiences. In this percentage were also some who complained of the pedantic approach of the instructor. The remainder of the disadvantages ranged over a series concerned with interference with high-school courses and activities, lack of conference time, and simultaneous adjustment to expectations at two instructional levels. Of the above responses, this writer believes that dissatisfaction with the level or interest of presentation should cause some concern, although the percentage of responses involved is not very great.

When asked for opinions about the best times for participation, the large majority (76 to 88%) recommended the twelfth grade and the summer session immediately preceding (or during) the twelfth grade. Under 30% recommended eleventh-grade participation, and 10% suggested that criteria other than grade placement be used. A wide variety of supplementary comments was appended.

When asked about any changes in attitudes towards, or expectations of college (Table 16), 70% responded. Thirty-seven percent found classes easier than expected; some of these added positive or negative value judgments in their responses. Although the unstructured nature of the question makes classification difficult, there were not many responses indicating that the attitudinal change was unfavorable towards LACC, or towards college in general; of 149 responses tallied, 14 could be considered unfavorable to the LACC experience.

Respondents offered a rather large variety of suggestions for the improvement of the program (Table 17). A rough classification immediately shows that 18% wanted the greatest possible latitude in course selection, and that the same number suggested that the load limit then in effect of five clock hours weekly be relaxed. Since the question was open-ended, these are significant suggestions. (Because of them, the Los Angeles City administrative committee liberalized the load limit for Fall, 1968 participants to 6 units.)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (continued)

The suggestions next in order of frequency, at 7% apiece, were the need for more high-school guidance in choice and description of courses, and the relaxing of present restrictions on eligibility so as to make the experience available to a broader spectrum of students attending the high schools. Close behind these was the suggestion that high schools publicize the program widely and early, so that students could plan their high-school programs from the beginning to take advantage of the opportunity. Other opinions were wide-ranging and somtimes contradictory; they are of considerable interest, and are listed in Table 17.

The results of the questionnaire indicate that the great majority of the responding participants view their initial experience in college on our campus quite favorably. Many of them recommend participation by more high-school students and in more courses. On the basis of their answers, as well as by their academic performance summarized in previous reports, the program appears to be successful and worth even greater encouragement by high-school and college advisors. The specific suggestions which apply to planning or advisement by personnel on the Los Angeles City College campus will be carefully considered as the basis for possible change.

# A P P E N D I X

HIGH SCHOOL-JUNIOR COLLEGE HONORS PROGRAM SURVEY

1. What were your reasons for participating in the program?

2. What were your reasons for choosing the subject(s) you enrolled in?

3. At that time, what college or colleges were you planning to attend after high school graduation?

4. What major were you planning?

5. Were your educational or vocational plans affected by participating in our program? Yes____ No_____

   Comments:

6. If you are now in college, where are you attending and what is your major?

7. If you did attend another college but are not now attending (a) where did you go? _____ (b) for how long? _____

   (c) what is your present occupation? _____

   (d) Do you plan to return to college? Yes_____ No _____

8. If you have not attended college since your L.A.C.C. Honors classes, (a) what is your present occupation? _____ (b) Do you have any plans for attending college in the near future? _____

9. Did you find that being in our program interfered with other activities in which you would have liked to share? If so, please check:

   a. School organizations_____
   b. Student body or class offices _____
   c. Senior class and pre-graduation activities_____
   d. Special high-school classes_____
   e. Out of school organizations_____
   f. Music or other special lessons_____
   g. Part-time work_____
   h. Other (specify)_____

   Comments:

10. As you look back on the high-school Honors program, what would you list as the advantages to you of having participated?

11. What disadvantages would you list?

12. Would you advise other qualified students to participate? Yes___ No____

    a. In the B11 semester? _____ Comments: _____

    b. In the A11 semester?_____ _____

    c. In the B12 semester?_____ _____

    d. In the A12 semester?_____ _____

    e. Summer sessions? _____ _____

13. As you recall it, what was the major change in your attitude towards or expectations of college resulting from your L.A.C.C. experience?

14. What suggestions do you have about course offerings, advisement, or any other parts of the program?

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE
855 North Vermont Avenue
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90029

Dear

In the _____ semester, _____, you enrolled in _____ as a participant in the Los Angeles City College High-School Honors program.

We are at present carrying out an evaluation of this program, and should be much interested in your reactions to the experience, now that some time has elapsed since you were here.

We hope that you will fill in the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the envelope provided, no later than MAY 1, 1968, if possible. You need not sign the questionnaire. We and future participants of the High-School Honors Program will greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Ruth S. Stein

Ruth S. Stein, Ed.D.
Coordinator, High-School
Honors Program

RSS/e
Enclosures